



# United States Department of the Interior

## OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS INTERIOR BOARD OF LAND APPEALS

4015 WILSON BOULEVARD  
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22203

ZADA ANDERSON ET AL.

IBLA 83-167

Decided January 13, 1983

Appeal from decision of California State Office, Bureau of Land Management, declaring unpatented mining claims abandoned and void. CA MC 58115 through CA MC 58117.

Affirmed.

1. Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976: Recordation of Affidavit of Assessment Work or Notice of Intention to Hold Mining Claim--Mining Claims: Recordation

Under sec. 314 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. § 1744 (1976), the owner of a mining claim located before Oct. 21, 1976, must file with the proper office of the Bureau of Land Management, on or before Oct. 22, 1979, a copy of the recorded notice of location and a notice of intention to hold the claim or evidence of assessment work performed on the claim, and prior to Dec. 31 of each calendar year thereafter a copy of the evidence of assessment work performed for that year or a notice of intention to hold the claim. There is no provision for waiver of this mandatory requirement, and where evidence of assessment work is not filed because it became lost in the mail, the consequence must be borne by the claimant.

2. Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976: Recordation of Mining Claims and Abandonment--Mining Claims: Abandonment

The conclusive presumption of abandonment which attends the failure to file an instrument required by 43 U.S.C. § 1744 (1976) is imposed by the statute itself.

A matter of law, the conclusive presumption is self-operative and does not depend upon any act or decision of an administrative official. In enacting the statute, Congress did not invest the Secretary with authority to waive or excuse noncompliance with the statute, or to afford claimants any relief from the statutory consequences.

3. Evidence: Presumptions--Evidence: Sufficiency

A presumption of regularity supports the official acts of public officers and, absent clear evidence to the contrary, it will be presumed that they have properly discharged their duties.

APPEARANCES: Zada Anderson, pro se.

OPINION BY ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE HENRIQUES

Appeal has been taken by Zada Anderson, Joseph E. Smith, and Harold Smith from the California State Office, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), decision dated October 1, 1982, which declared the unpatented Old Gilmore Nos. 1, 2, and 3 placer mining claims, CA MC 58115 through CA MC 58117, abandoned and void because no proof of labor or notice of intention to hold the claims for the period ending September 1, 1981, was filed with BLM on or before December 30, 1981, as required by section 314 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), 43 U.S.C. § 1744 (1976), and 43 CFR 3833.2-1.

Appellants state that the 1981 proof of labor was mailed to BLM in November 1981. A copy of the recorded proof submitted with the appeal shows that it was recorded in Siskiyou County, California, September 10, 1981.

[1] Section 314 of FLPMA, and the implementing regulations, 43 CFR 3833.2-1 and 3833.4(a), require that in the absence of performance of assessment work for each assessment year, a notice of intention to hold the unpatented claim must be filed in the office where the notice of location of the mining claim is recorded and in the proper office of BLM within the specified time limits, under penalty of a conclusive presumption that the claims have been abandoned if the documents are not timely or properly filed for recordation both in the proper county and with BLM.

Despite appellants' statement that the document was properly and timely mailed, the regulations define "file" to mean "being received and date stamped by the proper BLM office." 43 CFR 3833.1-2(a). Thus, even if the document had been mailed and an error by the Postal Service prevented it from reaching the BLM office, that fact would not excuse appellants' failure to comply with the cited regulations. Edna L. Patterson, 64 IBLA 316 (1982); Glenn D. Graham,



55 IBLA 39 (1981); Everett Yount, 46 IBLA 74 (1980); James E. Yates, 42 IBLA 391 (1979). This Board has repeatedly held that a mining claimant, having chosen the Postal Service as his means of delivery, must accept the responsibility and bear the consequences of loss or untimely delivery of his filings. Magdalene Pickering Franklin, 57 IBLA 244 (1981); Edward P. Murphy, 48 IBLA 211 (1980); Everett Yount, *supra*. Filing is accomplished only when a document is delivered to and received by the proper BLM office. Depositing a document in the mail does not constitute filing. 43 CFR 1821.2-2(f)

This Board has no authority to excuse lack of compliance with the statute or to afford any relief from the statutory consequences. Lynn Keith, 53 IBLA 192, 88 I.D. 36 (1981).

[2] As the Board stated in Lynn Keith, *supra*:

The conclusive presumption of abandonment which attends the failure to file an instrument required by 43 U.S.C. § 1744 (1976) is imposed by the statute itself, and would operate even without the regulations. See Northwest Citizens for Wilderness Mining Co., Inc. v. Bureau of Land Management, Civ. No. 78-46 (D. Mont. June 19, 1979). A matter of law, the conclusive presumption is self-operative and does not depend upon any act or decision of an administrative official. In enacting the statute, Congress did not invest the Secretary of the Interior with authority to waive or excuse noncompliance with the statute, or to afford claimants any relief from the statutory consequences. Thomas F. Byron, 52 IBLA 49 (1981).

53 IBLA at 196, 88 I.D. at 371-72.


[3] A legal presumption of regularity attends the official acts of public officers, and in the absence of clear evidence to the contrary, courts presume they have properly discharged their official duties. United States v. Chemical Foundation, 272 U.S. 1, 14-15 (1926); Kephart v. Richardson, 505 F.2d 1085, 1090 (3rd Cir. 1974); Lawrence E. Dye, 57 IBLA 360 (1981). Rebuttal of such a presumption requires the presentation of substantial countervailing evidence. Stone v. Stone, 136 F.2d 761, 763 (D.C. Cir. 1943).

We find the assertions of appellants do not constitute a sufficient predicate for holding that the proof of labor was properly transmitted to BLM and that BLM then lost it.


The Department has consistently held that one who entrusts to the Postal Service instruments for delivery to a BLM office is employing the Postal Service as his agent, and consequently must suffer the penalty for late delivery or loss of the mailed items. See Regina McMahon, 56 IBLA 372 (1981); Don Chris A. Coyne, 52 IBLA 1 (1981); Mobil Oil Co., 35 IBLA 265 (1978); Vern H. Bolinder, 30 IBLA 26 (1977); A. E. White, 28 IBLA 91 (1976).


Appellants may wish to consult with BLM about the possibility of relocating these claims.

Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to the Board of Land Appeals by the Secretary of the Interior, 43 CFR 4.1, the decision appealed from is affirmed.

  
Douglas E. Henriques  
Administrative Judge

We concur:

  
Will A. Irwin  
Administrative Judge

  
Bruce R. Harris  
Administrative Judge